

H
7N196

ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

Published Semi-Monthly by

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, Inc.

Empire State Bldg., New York 1, N. Y.
903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.
834 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.
1559 Continental Illinois Bank Bldg., Chicago 4, Ill.

Council Letter No. 183

January 15, 1948

Wanted—An American Foreign Policy

THE greatest service any political party can render the people of the United States is to formulate and secure the adoption of an *American* foreign policy. As a practical matter, that party must today be the Republican Party.

The foreign policy of the United States for the last fifteen years has resulted in most of the troubles, and has led to most of the dangers we face today.

The foreign policy we have followed has been a complete reversal of that urged by George Washington in his Farewell Address, and followed for 135 years. That policy of Washington's briefly urged us to look out for ourselves, probably on the theory that other nations could be counted on to look out for themselves, and that if we did not look out for ourselves nobody would do it for us.

Washington said:

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. . . . Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger on only one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests."

No more vital, more prophetic utterance ever came from a founding father. For as foreign influence has penetrated America, our Republican government has been weakened and something called "democracy" has tended to take its place. The change has been characterized by swollen spending and swollen debts, one politician after another dipping into the savings of the frugal half of the people and offering largesse to the less frugal. It has led to mounting cost of government, both financially and in the bureaucratic control and regimentation of the lives of the people. It has greatly reduced the God-given opportunity that was so long America's greatest lure to ambitious and earnest minds of the earth. And through the "organized smear," one of the greatest weapons of Collectivism,

real patriots have been made to appear "suspected and odious," while the "tools and dupes" of the New Deal have received applause—and many have filled their pockets.

America's foreign policy is the greatest domestic issue before the American people today. Its being "foreign" makes it no less domestic. For it will affect the lives and fortunes of Americans more than any so-called domestic issue that will come up—more, indeed, than all of them.

F.D.R. Cast America Loose From Ancient Moorings

From the time when Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia in 1933 to his death in 1945, America's foreign policy was largely foreign-conceived, foreign-born and foreign-nurtured. The President of the greatest Republic and most successful nation the world has ever seen, was persuaded (how or why we will not at this time examine) to discard all American experience and to permit his country's policy to be framed by alien minds.

Not only this, but Roosevelt caused laws to be passed, regulations and "directives" (a foreign, imported word itself) to be issued, that gave every advantage to the alien-minded in this country, and caused any American who stood up for the traditions and long experience of the country to be subjected to smears, often to disgrace and sometimes even to death.

Just as Washington said, real patriots who resisted the intrigues of "the favorite" (the ultra-liberal, the socialistic and the communistic) became "suspected and odious," while the "tools and dupes" of these foreign isms usurped the confidence and applause of the people and led to their surrendering more and more of their interests.

Under the Truman Administration a number of those closer to the late Mr. Roosevelt, and consequently more likely to carry on his alien traditions, have resigned or been gotten rid of. As a result the Truman policy in some respects has been less objectionable, than the Roosevelt policy. Yet enough of the former "palace guard" remains to make the present situation highly dangerous even to the very existence of the American Republic.

It was, among other things we believe, against this very alien influence in the United States that the voters rebelled in the Congressional elections of 1946. We may remember the slogan which had no small part in defeating the New Dealers that year, "Had enough?—Vote Republican." And they spoke with emphasis.

For the first time since 1932 the voters had something of a chance to say what they thought of the events of the previous fourteen years.

But while in some respects—as with labor, legislation, tax reduction and other matters—the Republican Congress responded to the mandate of 1946, yet, for some curious reason, in the most important field of all, namely, foreign affairs, it made practically no response whatever. Under the same alien influence that had dominated the Roosevelt Administration, the Republican Party continued to play along with the fantastic idea that independent political judgment must not be applied beyond "the water's edge" (alien influence framed that one, too)—that we must have a bi-partisan foreign policy. And so we continued to have what was called a bi-partisan foreign policy, but which is nothing in the world but the same old New Deal policy. A few handpicked Republicans were called in consultation, puffed up with a pride not experienced for a long time, extolled to the skies by the widely circulated New Deal press and on radio and screen: and presto—they had implemented a "bi-partisan foreign policy." What happened was that the Republicans had largely abdicated.

Our "Bi-Partisan Foreign Policy" Is Alien Inspired

Now, if our foreign policy from 1933 to date had been, as it should have been, an *American* policy, it would have been such that the other major party coming to power in Congress in January, 1947, could readily have supported. But it wasn't American—it was an alien foreign policy. It was inspired by European Collectivism—largely by Communism. It was a travesty on American tradition and on the American heritage. Hence, for the Republican Party to join in it was well-nigh treasonable.

This "non-partisan foreign policy" was conceived in appeasement of Soviet Russia and Collectivism generally. Its character is changing somewhat as a Soviet-produced war becomes ever more imminent; but its nature still survives, as, for instance, in the otherwise unexplained continuance of our policy of hostility toward Franco Spain. At a time when we are in grave danger of finding ourselves at war with Russia—a war in which, incidentally, Great Britain may hold aloof—we continue in the Iberian Peninsula to play Russia's game by listening to the *Daily Worker*, *PM*, *The Nation* and the *New Republic*, all of whom in greater or less degree represent the communistic influence in the United States, and we refuse to deal with that country in Europe which never in its history has defaulted on a public debt, whose citizens are perhaps the greatest fighters in all Europe, and whose leader conducted the people through a successful revolt against growing communist control of the Spanish "Republic."

Incidentally the strongest accusation the apologists for that "Republic" seem to feel they can bring against Franco is to assure us that the Republic was the lawfully elected government of Spain. Granting for the

sake of argument (and for that reason only) that this is true, we seem to recall that the fact that in the American Colonies in 1776 Great Britain was the lawful government, did not prevent our sturdy ancestors from revolting against the mother country.

Foreign Policy the Most Serious Issue

America's foreign policy will be the most serious issue in next fall's election. It may not—no one can yet tell—appeal so directly to the mass of voters as prices and taxes, but foreign policy will affect their lives as no other issue can. *For present administration policy is leading to almost certain war.* And no healthier thing could happen than for the Republican Party to revert to a truly American foreign policy. The American people are entitled to have the chance to say whether they wish their foreign affairs to be conducted in all respects or in any respect under alien influence, or prefer instead to have a policy that is an American policy. If the Republicans will face this question unequivocally and give the American people the chance to pass on it, they will retain both Houses of Congress by larger majorities, and they will be swept back into power in the White House. If they do not, they will lose in Congress; they will fail to elect a President; and they may well pass out of existence as a dominant political party.

The policy of the United States has been formed by means of slogans false in their imputations, false propaganda on the air, on the screen, in the press and even in the pulpits, and through alien-thinking lecturers in all parts of the country.

Under this false and misleading influence we were swept into a war that cost 300,000 American lives, used up all or nearly all of some of our most precious natural resources, and added \$240 billion to our national debt. Under this false propaganda we were led to acquiesce in the vindictive policy of unconditional surrender; in the establishment of a dangerous precedent for all civilians in the prosecution and execution of certain German civilian leaders, and in the policy of reducing Germany to a pastoral level. Under this same false propaganda we were lured into a thing called the United Nations—an organization which has continued to exist as long as it has only because of the almost constant willingness of Americans to concede anything in order to keep it alive.

Under this same false propaganda we have become involved—no one seems to know quite how—in seven or eight international organizations which in some respects appear to be agencies of the United Nations, and in others seem surprisingly independent of it. At this very moment, in the city of Havana, American bureaucrats and those of other countries are considering an "International Trade Organization" framed by bureaucrats representing various countries; and after the American delegates have conceded everything necessary in order to bring back "an agreement" for submission to Congress, there will probably be turned loose in America an avalanche of propaganda at taxpayers' expense praising this document, just as the United Nations Agreement, the Bretton Woods Proposals, the International Refugee Organization, and all the others were praised in their several turns. But the net result of these organizations will be to tie the vital interests of the American people into such knots

that no Philadelphia lawyer or any judge that ever lived will be able to say what they even mean.

America will be hog-tied. America will foot the bills. America will not materially raise the standard of living for other countries. But America will be brought down to the level of collectivist countries.

Thus over these recent years the American people have been propagandized into bartering away their liberty.

The Great Question

The question is, what is the Republican Party going to do about all this? We have today a foreign policy made and controlled by a clique of crafty individuals, able apparently to command any amount of financial help. This clique is engaged in the task of getting the whole world into its hands; for if it could complete its conquest over the United States it would then well-nigh have the whole world in its hands, because this clique seems to be working not too unsuccessfully with Soviet Russia. The clique is in cahoots with International Communism.

* * * * *

Economic Council Letter No. 177 contained a letter from Mr. Benjamin H. Freedman in which as an American and a Jew he protested against the Zionist attempts to persuade the Assembly of the United Nations to vote for the partition of Palestine. He predicted dire consequences in Palestine if this partition were to be voted. He said there would be substantial killing of the Jews in Palestine and in other Arab countries; and it has turned out precisely in this way. He said that the 100 million Arabs of Northern Africa and the Near East, among whom for over a hundred years the United States had built up a substantial amount of goodwill and have converted many to Christianity, would be violently alienated by this action; and it has turned out precisely this way.

As we noted in Letter No. 181, the President of the United States went all out in bringing pressure upon Liberia, Haiti and the Philippines, all of whom had announced their intention of voting against partition. This attitude of the President can be explained in no other way than that he did it under pressure. The source of the pressure is obvious. Since Soviet Russia was the only major country that voted with the United States in the Assembly of UN to partition Palestine, it may be taken as certain that the Russian Reds are working closely with the Jewish minority who call themselves Zionists.

Now it has been the habit for some years in this country, under systematic intimidation by a small minority of aggressive Zionists, to skirt around any problem in which Jewish influence figured. We believe the time has come for all Americans to speak out, unafraid. The time has come to put minority agitation in the background, and to put the main emphasis on what is good for the whole American people. The rights of minorities should be protected. At the instance of Communism, the country for some years has been rocked with agitation ostensibly to protect Jews and Negroes from discrimination. The great majority of Jews and Negroes have been victims, not beneficiaries, of this agitation. In the long run, politicians who sub-

mit to minority blackmail in the hope of getting the votes of minorities, who discover that if any segment of the population is entitled to special consideration, it is the great majority—not any minority.

Governor Dewey may discover that his forcing through an unwilling legislature in 1945 of the so-called Anti-discrimination Law was not good policy after all.

In Letter 184, to appear February 1, we shall publish a program which we shall submit to both major parties. It will be designed to further the true interests of the American people. It will lay special stress on foreign policy.

The Communist Peril

The communist danger is very great. By that we mean, among other things, that the danger of communist violence in the United States is great. War may not break out between the United States and Russia within the next two or three years, but we do say emphatically that it is entirely possible.

In the event of such war, the communist fifth column in the United States will swing into action. Every Communist Party member has been trained in the deceit and ruthlessness described in an article in *Life* Magazine of January 5, 1948. Since our merchant marine, as well as other public services or near-public services, is largely in the hands of Communists, and since the Communist Party has set up a cell of members in practically every activity of any consequence, public and private, in event of war only the promptest and most courageous action by government will be able to restrain the outbreak of civil war. Planned rioting, strikes and general strikes, with sabotage of every kind—such as brought near chaos to France in November-December, 1947—will be attempted here. Industries essential to the national defense, already ruled to a great degree by communist-dominated labor unions, can be crippled. The electrical industries, now in the clutches of a communist-controlled union, would probably be the first to be stopped.

Our readers can form their own opinion of how likely the present Administration would be to act as forcefully, if need be, as did the Schuman government of France. Imagine the American Administration ordering 235,000 troops ready to put down communist inspired riots, as Schuman did, and having a law passed protecting the right of every American to go to and from his work, and jailing everyone who interferes with that right. That law and the presence of those soldiers ended the communist strikes in France! But the habit of miserable appeasement of Communists is deeply ingrained in American public life. There are still communist sympathizers in the Administration.

The danger from American Communists, even if there are only 75,000 of them in the United States, is so great that before the ordinary American citizen woke up, war with Russia might be well-nigh lost right here on the domestic front.

All this is based merely on the known objectives and methods of Communist Parties everywhere, on what has nearly succeeded in France and Italy, and has actually happened in countries like Yugoslavia, Poland and other countries where the Communists have taken over.

The early pattern was set by Lenin and Trotsky, by first infiltrating, then controlling, the labor unions in communications, transport and finance.

There are said to be only 15 or 18 thousand Communists in New York City. That would be plenty to take over the entire city, especially Manhattan Island. It might be that within a few days American troops, unless themselves prevented by sabotage or treachery, could retake the city. But in the interval thousands—perhaps tens of thousands—of citizens who showed the least inclination to defend themselves (unless resistance was general), and many thousands of persons who at any time had ever spoken or acted against Communism, would be destroyed. The rest of the population would be terrified into complete inaction. A wolf isn't afraid of any number of sheep. And, unless they awoken soon, when this day comes ignorance will be found to have made sheep of multitudes of Americans.

It is well to remember the usual communist order issued in cities taken over by these gangsters, namely, that the doors of all houses and apartments are to remain unlocked at all times. That makes easier whatever killing, looting and raping the Communists may desire.

Let it not be doubted for a moment that the Communists possess effective weapons. Laws like the New York State Sullivan Law which tend to disarm all save the lawless, forbidding even the ownership by private persons of machine guns, we may be sure have been ignored by the Communists.

A Concrete Suggestion

We have one concrete suggestion to make to every citizen who is impressed by the potential danger. *Let him possess himself of one or more guns, making sure that they are in good condition, that he and other members of his family know how to use them, and that he has a reasonable supply of ammunition.* To buy and possess such guns will, in most States, require a license. In New York State, for instance, such a license is obtainable, outside of Greater New York, from the County Judge; in New York City from the Police Department. In other States the statutes should be consulted as to how one may lawfully obtain and keep a gun.

These licenses apply, certainly in most places, only to guns that may be concealed—that is to pistols of the usual sort. No license is required to own a rifle or shotgun. Every citizen should make certain that he has lawfully in his possession either a pistol or a rifle, and if he has more than one it will do no harm.

It is not without significance that in recent years left-wingers have constantly pressed for passage of laws requiring a license to own a gun, or, in some instances, forbidding private citizens to have guns. The same influences have urged federal legislation requiring federal registration of all firearms privately owned—which of course would enable the Communists to know exactly who possessed weapons.

Much of the reason for the massacring of private

citizens and for the looting and other violence that took place in Spain prior to and in the early days of the Civil War, took place because such statutes had been passed and private citizens deprived of the only means they had available to protect themselves.

Let Americans not make the same mistake.

In certain jurisdictions it will be found relatively easy to obtain gun licenses; in others more difficult. Where it seems too difficult suspicion would be warranted as to why. Interested citizens might well counsel together to see what could be done about it.

In this connection it is of interest that advertisements have appeared in newspapers disclosing that some people are interested in purchasing large quantities of second-hand guns. In one case we heard of we caused inquiry to be made, and the source of the demand for these guns could not be found. Possibly they were intended to be sent to Palestine, as was the TNT discovered by accident the other day in a Palestine-bound ship in New York harbor. Possibly it was an organized effort to draw away as many guns as possible from private hands.

But in any event we advise all our readers to proceed lawfully to equip themselves so they and their households may not be defenseless if what happened in Spain and France happens here. It will be better to have guns, and have them ready, and not have to use them, than to have the need for them arise and not have them.

The Lord helps those who help themselves.

Merwin K. Hart

President,

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, Inc.

Subscription price of Council Letter, issued semi-monthly and Action Report, issued monthly, together with Council Review of Books edited by Rose Wilder Lane and issued monthly.

12 months	\$10.00
6 months	6.00
3 months	3.50
Airmail—Domestic	11.20
Airmail—Western Europe	18.00
Other Countries—Rates on request.	

Special rate for student or teacher, \$5.00 a year.

Send subscriptions to New York office.

Extra copies this Letter:

1 to 10	10c each
11 to 99	7c each
100	\$6.00
500	\$5.00 per 100
1000	\$4.00 per 100

Special prices for larger quantities on request.

Copyright, 1948, National Economic Council, Inc.

This Council Letter may be quoted in whole or part, provided due credit is given to the National Economic Council, Inc., and provided the quotation is specified to be from Economic Council Letter No. 183, January 15, 1948.